



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ἐὶς τὸν Θεὸν ἀνὰ πᾶσι ἡμέραις, ἀγῶν ῥιθμῶν ἀπὸ ἀνὸς ὁσίων θεῶν τοῦ ναὸς ὁσίων.

LXXXII. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 29.

MAY, 1854.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Infallible Church not Infallible	55
The Life of St. Philomena—"The Young Christian's Library"	56
How far is the Reformation affected by the characters and motives of the Reformers—No. II.	57
The Heir of Ballymannus—No. III.	58
Is the Scaffold the safest way to Heaven?	61
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Cardinal Bellarmine and the CATHOLIC LAYMAN—by Investigator	62
On Infallibility—by Mr. Rourke	63
On Prayers for the Dead and the Burial Service—by Mr. E. Power	63
Flowers for May	65
Farming Operations for May	65

THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH NOT INFALLIBLE.

IN Dr. Johnson's interesting tale of Rasselas, prince of Abyssinia, with which many of our readers are, doubtless, familiar, one of the most amusing chapters is that which records the fate of the ingenious artist, who attempted to discover the method of making wings. Before his project was quite ripe for trial, we are told that, in the course of a conversation with the prince, he drew a vivid picture of the new pleasures of which mankind would shortly be put in possession, as the result of his fortunate discovery. "With what delight," said he, "will a philosopher, furnished with wings, and hovering in the sky, see the earth and all its inhabitants rolling beneath him! How it must amuse the spectator to see the moving scene of land and ocean; to survey, with equal security, the marts of trade, and the fields of battle! How easily shall we then trace the Nile through all his passages, pass over to distant regions, and examine the face of nature from one extremity of the earth to the other!"

Rasselas, we are told, modestly suggested some doubts of the practicability of the design. He hinted that the imagination of the artist prevailed over his skill, and that it suggested rather what he *wished* than what he *knew*. His fears, however, were dismissed as groundless. "Nothing," replied the artist, "will ever be attempted if all possible objections must be first overcome." At length, the wings were finished, and the time came to make trial of them. The attempt was made, and the adventurous artist waved his pinions for flight; but, alas for the vanity of human wishes! in an instant he dropped into the lake beneath, and the prince had much difficulty in drawing him to land.

We have often thought that the incident just related is an apt illustration of the modern Romish theory of infallibility. Nothing can be more attractive than the picture which Bishop Milner, and other Roman Catholic writers, draw of the blessings arising from the possession of an infallible guide in all matters of religion. "How delightful," say they, "to feel oneself raised, as on eagle's wings, above the atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty, which envelopes poor, benighted Protestants, dimly groping after truth! How satisfactory to be able to survey, in calm security, the contentions of rival sects, and the angry warfare of religious parties! If borne aloft by the principle of infallibility, how easily can we trace the stream of orthodox doctrine from its earliest origin, and discern the distant regions over which the Catholic Church is spread, from one extremity of the earth to the other!"

Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
Atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum
Subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis arari.

All this is, doubtless, very pleasing and very delightful to think of and write about; but the mere fact of our *wishing* for such an infallible teacher as would save us all trouble in religion, does nothing towards assuring us that God has actually given us such a guide. We have seen that the artist, in the tale, often consoled his mind with similar visions, when he was employed in his attempt to provide for mankind organs which God did not see fit to bestow upon them. The wings, however ingeniously contrived, failed to accomplish the purpose for which the artist designed them; and the question naturally arises, does the infallibility, claimed by the Church of

Rome, actually realize the delightful promises its advocates make on its behalf? We shall endeavour to lay a few facts before our readers, which will enable them to answer this question for themselves.

Hence, then, arises the necessity for an infallible guide, and what is the great advantage to be derived from one? Roman Catholic divines always take for granted that the great mass of mankind are utterly unable to arrive at the knowledge of the truths of revelation for themselves. They assume that God must be supposed to have provided for all men a safe and easy method of attaining to religious truth—in other words, an infallible guide. From these premises they conclude that this guide can be no other than the Church of Rome, which they always identify with the whole Catholic Church. They boldly assert that the local Church of Rome has always taught the pure doctrines of Christianity, from the time of St. Paul to the present day; that she has never fallen into the *slightest error or heresy*—in short, that all her authoritative statements may be implicitly embraced, as setting forth those important truths which will make men wise unto salvation. Here, then, they tell us, is the infallible guide we need. If we listen to her, we are secure from the seductions of false doctrine; if we tread in her footsteps, we are in no danger of going astray.

But is it a fact, that the Church of Rome has never varied in her doctrines or teaching? Has she never put forth contradictory statements upon vital questions of religion? A Church which claims infallibility must of necessity be always the same. One instance of contradiction is enough to destroy all reliance upon her testimony, just as one plain unequivocal lie is fatal to a man's character for veracity. Jesus Christ, the great head of the Church, is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8), and it follows, that all the doctrines which claim Him as their author, and rest upon His authority, must necessarily agree.

Let us, then, suppose the case of some honest, sober-minded Christian, whose sole anxiety is to be taught the truth. He is told, that the Church of Rome claims to be infallible, and that he may safely place himself under her guidance. He sets his mind, therefore, to learn the doctrines propounded by that Church from the earliest times; he prepares to soar aloft upon the wings of infallibility, that he may contemplate, as from some lofty eminence, the broad stream of Catholic doctrine flowing down from the first ages of Christianity, and taking its rise in the city of the seven hills.

But, when he tries to spread his wings, is the attempt successful? or, to drop the metaphor, does our inquirer find that the Church of Rome is, in point of fact, infallible? Alas! far from it. Let us hear the evidence of one of the acutest thinkers and ablest writers of the seventeenth century, one who certainly had no prejudices against Romanism, for he was himself, in early years, a Roman Catholic—"I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, councils against councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age." The theory of the Church of Rome being an unerring, infallible guide in religion, like many other theories, looks very well upon paper, and has a plausible, captivating look as long as it is not tested by facts; but let any adventurous inquirer, who is in search of truth, and wishes for some better evidence for his religion than the mere word of a priest, only try to put this principle of infallibility to the test—let him attempt to spread his wings, and he finds, on a sudden, that they *won't work*. A host of Popes and Cardinals, councils and divines, pour their discordant blasts upon his head from all the four winds of heaven; and fortunate will he be if, as the result of his rash experiment, he is not plunged deep beneath the dark waters of hopeless infidelity.

We have said that, as a matter of fact, the Church of Rome cannot be infallible, for that she has contradicted herself at various times in the statement of important doctrines of Christianity. General assertions, however, rarely carry conviction along with them, unless they are supported by proofs. We proceed, therefore, to substantiate our charge, by citing a few of these contradictory statements, with the authorities on which they rest. We take,

for the sake of convenience, the catechism and decrees of the Council of Trent, as the most authoritative exposition of the doctrines of the modern Church of Rome; and by a comparison of these decrees with the recorded opinions of some of the ancient Popes and divines of that Church, even the most unlearned of our readers will be able to judge whether Romanism is as infallible as she pretends. We give accurate references, as usual, to all the authorities which we quote.

1. And first, concerning the important doctrine of *The Eucharist*.

The modern Church of Rome teaches as follows:—"By the consecration of the bread and wine, the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine is converted into the substance of his blood; which conversion is suitably and properly called transubstantiation."—Decret. Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii., c. iv.

Now, listen to the doctrine of the ancient Church of Rome.

Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492) writes as follows:—"The sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, which we receive, are divine things, because by these we are made partakers of the divine nature. Nevertheless, the *substance or nature of bread and wine ceases not to exist*; and, assuredly, the *image and similitude* of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the performance of the mysteries."

Is it possible for two statements to be more directly opposed to one another than these?†

2. Communion in one kind.

The modern Church of Rome teaches thus—"If any person shall say, that it is required either by the precept of God, or for necessity of salvation, that all the faithful in Christ shall partake of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds, *let him be accursed*."—Decret. Conc. Trid. Sess. xxi., can. 1.

Now, let us hear what was the custom and practice of the old Roman Church on this point.

S. Thomas Aquinas says, that, "according to the *ancient custom of the Church, all men*, as they communicated in the body, so they also communicated in the blood."‡

The testimony of Cassander, the famous Romish ritualist, is still more express to the same effect—"In the Latin Church, for above a *thousand years*, the body of Christ and the blood of Christ were separately given, the body apart, and the blood apart, after the consecration of the mysteries."§

These authorities show pretty plainly the *novelty* of the decree of the Council of Trent, on the subject of half communion. The following extract, from Pope Gelasius, is equally plain, as to its *unlawfulness*:—"We find that some, having received a portion of the holy body only, do abstain from the cup of the holy blood, who, doubtless (because they are bound by I know not what superstition), should receive the whole sacrament, or be driven from the whole; for the dividing of one and the same mystery cannot be done without great sacrilege."||

* Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divina efficiuntur consortes nature; et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur.—Gelasius, de duabus naturis in Christo. Bibl. Vet. Patrum, tom. viii., p. 703. Lugd., 1677.

† The contradiction between the sentiments of Pope Gelasius and the Decree of the Council of Trent, is, indeed, so glaring, that Bellarmine and Bellarmine were obliged to resort to the desperate expedient of attempting to prove that the treatise above named was not written by Pope Gelasius, but by some other man of the same name! The Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, however, to his credit be it spoken, possessed more honesty than the brace of Cardinals. He exposed the hollowiness of this "pious fraud," and proved incontrovertibly that the work in question was rightly ascribed to Pope Gelasius.—Vide Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., vol. i., p. 530. Dublin, 1723.

‡ "Secundum antiquæ ecclesiæ consuetudinem, omnes, sicut communicabant corpori, ita communicabant et sanguini."—S. Thom. in Joannem, cap. vii., sec. vii., p. 363. Paris, 1640.

§ "Occidentalis vero, sive Romana Ecclesia mille amplius annis continua, non alter quam sub duplici hac specie in conventu Ecclesiæ sacramentum hoc Dominici corporis et sanguinis administrasse legitur, idque in pane et vino, atque adæd separatim."—Cassander, de Sacram. Commun., p. 1025. Paris, 1616.

|| "Comperimus quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacri crucis abstinere; qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio quâ superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire."—Corpus Juris Canonici, De Consecr., Dist. II., cap. 12, tom. i., col. 1918. Lugd., 1671.

It is quite plain, that the curse of the venerable Fathers of the Council of Trent would have lighted on the head of poor Pope Gelasius, if he had had the ill fortune to have been alive in their time.

3. *Solitary masses by a priest.*

The Council of Trent decreed as follows:—"If any person shall say, that masses, in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, are unlawful, and, therefore, ought to be abrogated, let him be accursed."—Decret. Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii., can. 8.

But, the ancient Church of Rome taught the very reverse. Thus, for example, the Romish canon law tells us, that Anacletus, Bishop of Rome, decreed "that all present should communicate, or else be turned out of the Church: for so the Apostles did order, and the holy Church of Rome observeth."*

And Gregory I. forbids the priest to celebrate the Eucharist alone—"A priest," saith he, "should never celebrate the mass alone; for as the mass cannot be celebrated without the salutation of the priest, and the answer of the people, it ought, consequently, by no means to be celebrated by a single individual."†

We may well ask, which is infallible, Pope Gregory the Great or the Council of Trent?

4. *The Seven Sacraments.*

The doctrine of the Council of Trent runs thus—"If any person shall say, that all the sacraments of the new law were not instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that they are more or fewer than seven, let him be accursed."—Decret. Conc. Trid., Sess. vii., can. 1.

But we are assured, on the unexceptionable authority of Cassander, "that we shall not likely find any writer before Peter Lombard [who lived about 1190] that did define the number of the sacraments!"‡ And the famous canonist, Alex. de Ales, states particularly, with regard to confirmation, that "this sacrament was instituted in the Meldensian Council."§ Did the Church not know how many sacraments it had before the twelfth century, or was it left to Peter Lombard and the Meldensian Council to inform it upon a matter of such vital importance to every Christian man? And yet, notwithstanding all this, the Church of Rome claims to be immutable as well as infallible!

5. *Worship of Images.*

In the catechism of the Council of Trent we read as follows—"The priest is to teach that it is lawful to have images in churches, and to give them honour and worship."||

The worship of images, however, was forbidden in the most express terms by Pope Gregory the Great. In a letter to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, he writes—"Forbid, by every means in your power, the worship of images."¶

Ordinary persons will, perhaps, be of opinion that the doctrine of Pope Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, corresponds more nearly with God's law, as laid down in the Second Commandment, than does the doctrine of the Council of Trent. One thing, however, is pretty clear, that Pope Gregory and the Council cannot both be right.

6. *Supremacy of the Pope.*

The earliest assumption by a Pope of the title of Universal Bishop of the Christian Church, appears to have been by Boniface III., in the beginning of the seventh century. At a later period Gregory VII. declared "that the Roman Pontiff alone can be properly called universal."** In the fourteenth century Pope Boniface VIII. published his famous Bull, "*Unam Sanctam*" (which was inserted in the Canon law) to the following effect—"We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be absolutely necessary to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."††

This decree asserts the Pope's claim to the office of universal bishop, in very clear and unmistakable terms. And in conformity to it we find that, at the end of the Bull of Pope Pius IV., confirming the decrees of the Council of Trent, the first signature is—"Ego Pius, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Episcopus"—i.e., "I, Pius, Bishop of the Universal Church," standing at the head of a long list of cardinals and ordinary diocesan bishops.‡‡

Now let us hear the sentiments of Pope Gregory the

Great, in the sixth century. The Bishop of Constantinople had laid claim to this title of Ecumenical or Universal Bishop, whereupon Pope Gregory writes as follows—"I earnestly admonish my brother and fellow-bishop, that if he had any regard for the peace and concord of the Church, he would abstain from this foolish title. For I confidently assert, that whoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is the forerunner of Antichrist, because he proudly sets himself above others."*

If any of our readers, after comparing the foregoing extracts, should see cause to agree with Pope Gregory the Great, we must confess that we think they could not be very greatly blamed. But, between such contradictory and discordant opinions, not of one, but of several Popes, we ask again, where lies the infallibility?

7. *Indulgences.*

The Council of Trent decreed as follows—"The power of conferring indulgences was given by Christ to his Church; and the Church hath made use of this power in the most ancient times."†

When we turn to Cardinal Cajetan, however, what do we read?—"Concerning the rise of indulgences," saith he, "if any certainty could be had, it would aid us in discovering the truth; but no authority of sacred Scripture, or of ancient Greek or Latin Fathers hath brought this knowledge to us."‡

If there be no mention of indulgences in Scripture, or any ancient writer, with what face could the venerable fathers of the Council of Trent make the bold assertion we have quoted above?

8. *Purgatory.*

The decree of the Council of Trent, on the subject of Purgatory, is singularly moderate, considering the generally confident and sweeping manner in which this grave assembly of divines scattered their anathemas on other subjects. They assert merely "that there is a purgatory."—(purgatorium esse, Sess. xxv.) The catechism of the Council went a little farther, and speaks of "the fire of purgatory, in which the souls of the pious expiate (their sins) by torture, for a definite time."§

Now, what doctrine was taught by the ancient Church of Rome, with regard to the state of souls after death? Let us begin with the respectable authority of Pope Gregory the Great. In his commentary on Job, he writes as follows:—"At the moment of death, either the good or the evil spirit seizes upon the soul as it departs from the prison of the flesh, and keeps it for ever with itself, without any change."|| Does this passage look as if Pope Gregory (whatever his precise sentiments may have been) believed in the modern Romish doctrine of purgatory?

But, perhaps, the testimony of the old writer, Polydore Vergil, is still more express on this point. (His statements, we may observe in passing, were considered of such dangerous tendency, that they came under the ban of the Roman Index Expurgatorius.) They are as follows:—

"For what cause, or by what authority, indulgences were first introduced into the Church, has given modern divines a great deal of trouble. In a subject which is by no means clear, I think it better to use the testimony of John, Bishop of Rochester [Bishop Fisher], in a work which he wrote against Luther. 'Many persons,' saith he, 'are inclined to place but little reliance upon indulgences, because their use seems to have come in rather late in the Church.' And, then, he adds—"No orthodox [Roman Catholic] doubts whether there is a purgatory, concerning which, nevertheless, there is either no mention or the very rarest mention in ancient writers (nemo certe dubitat orthodoxum, an purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud prisca nulla vel quam rarissima ferebat mentio). To this day, purgatory is not believed in by the Greek Church. As long, then, as there was no anxiety concerning purgatory, no one looked for indulgences; for all the value of indulgences depends upon it. If you take away purgatory, what use will there be in indulgences? Indulgences, therefore, began when people began to entertain fears about the torments of purgatory.' These things, saith the Bishop (Fisher); but you, my reader, may, perhaps, think the subject of so great importance, that you might expect more certainty in the matter from the mouth of God" (quæ tu fortè cum tanti sint momenti, ut magis certa ex ore Dei expectabaris).¶

We cordially concur in opinion with old Polydore Vergil. A subject of such vital importance to the peace and happi-

ness of every true Christian is surely one, if there be any, or which we might expect some certain authority in holy Scripture, some reliable information in ancient writers. But, alas! Bishop Fisher tells us, there is none or next to none. During several centuries, it would seem, the people never frightened themselves about purgatory, but, at last, the priests, or somebody else, put them all in a state of alarm, and then they began to look for indulgences. For, as the old bishop very candidly asks, If you take away purgatory, what use will there be in indulgences?

One use, indeed, there was of indulgences, to which we can now only briefly allude. The Council of Trent condemned all "disgraceful traffic" in indulgences (pravos quæstus omnino abolendos esse, Sess. xxv.), thereby tacitly admitting that they had been disgracefully bought and sold, in many parts of Christendom. If the priests, for a series of ages, were covetous men—if they could frighten the people generally into the belief of a purgatory which had no existence, and could persuade them to buy indulgences, in order to deliver themselves or their friends from these visionary torments, we can see, even without the aid of Bishop Fisher, how the belief of both purgatory and indulgences gradually crept into the Church.

We are sorry to leave our readers in purgatory, but our limits warn us that we must conclude for the present. We have merely touched on a few of the most obvious topics, on which the ancient and modern Church of Rome are directly at variance. If there be even one such point (and every scholar knows that there are several) what becomes of the boasted claim of Romish infallibility? To find even one plain error and contradiction in a Church calling itself infallible, is to overthrow the pretended authority of that Church. For what is the usual reason given for forsaking other Churches, but because they are fallible? What is the reason why some few go over to the Church of Rome, and why most of its members remain in it, but because she is (as they are made to believe) infallible? But if, with her infallibility, she has mistaken error for truth; if with her certainty she contradicts herself; if she was one thing in one age, and another in another, then there is the same or greater reason for all such persons to quit the Church of Rome, as there seemed to be at first for them to embrace it, or continue in it.

ST. PHILOMENA.

As ardent lovers of our country, we feel a warm sympathy with all those who labour for the benefit of Ireland, and especially with those who exert themselves in the department of labour in which we are ourselves employed—namely, the diffusing religious information among the people. It was, accordingly, with some interest that we watched the results of an announcement, made by Mr. Duffy, at the commencement of the present year, when he declared his intention to issue weekly a series of "Sweet little books," each number containing the life of some saint or great servant of God, to be published at the low price of one penny, and so to place edifying and instructive reading within the reach of the very poorest classes. But we found that, however heartily we approved of the general character of this plan, we could by no means bestow the same commendation on the manner in which it was carried out. In fact, when we pronounce it desirable to circulate religious information at a cheap rate among the people, we consider it absolutely essential that the information circulated shall be true. But we fear the compilers of Mr. Duffy's little volumes hold the historic accuracy of their biographies to be a matter of minor importance, and that they believe, that a work containing the life of a saint must be sure to be edifying reading, even though its details be as pure fiction as any novel writer of the present day has imagined. Several of these tracts would be reduced to very narrow dimensions indeed, were we to pare away from them all that was mere legend, unsupported by any historical evidence. We felt, however, that it was rather a delicate matter to criticise these mixtures of truth and falsehood, lest in assailing the falsehood we should be represented as enemies of the truth to which it was joined, or lest in exposing a legend told of a saint we should seem to throw ridicule upon the venerable saint himself. But there is one volume of the "Young Christian's Library" which we can review without being troubled with any fear of this kind; and in calling our readers' attention to the LIFE OF SAINT PHILOMENA we can assure them beforehand, that the task of separating the parts of the story which are true from those which are false is one which will not be attended with the slightest difficulty.

But who is Saint Philomena? exclaims one of our ignorant Protestant readers. Saint Philomena, you should be ashamed not to know, is one of the most popular saints of the present day on the Continent, and it will not be Mr. Duffy's fault if she is not so in Ireland too. There is a fashion about saints as about everything else, and before the commencement of the present century (for reasons hereafter to be explained) Saint Philomena had not a single votary to demand her intercession. Now, however, after fifteen centuries' inactivity, she has commenced working miracles, resolved to make up for lost time, and, as we have said, counts her worshippers by thousands in Spain, and France, and Italy. In the sketch of her history which we give, Mr. Duffy is our chief authority, though we borrow a few particulars from a French and

* "Peractâ consecratione, omnes communicant qui voluerint ecclesiasticis carere limitibus: sic enim et apostoli statuerunt, et sancta Romana tenet ecclesia."—Corp. Jur. Can., tom. i., col. 1617. Lugd., 1671.

† "Sacerdos missam solus nequaquam celebrat; quin sicut illa celebrari non potest sine salutatore sacerdotis et responsione nihilominus plebis, ita nihilum nequaquam ab uno debet celebrari."—Cassander, Liturg., p. 88. Paris, 1616.

‡ "Nec temere quinquam reperies ante Petrum Lombardum, qui certum aliquem et definitum sacramentorum numerum statuerunt."—Cassander, p. 981. Paris, 1616.

§ "Institutum fuit hoc sacramentum spiritus sancti inflectu in concilio Meldensi."—Alex. Alea, Op. Omn., vol. i., p. 209. Venet., 1575.

|| "Non solum autem iterum in ecclesiis imagines habere, et his honorum et cultus sublimior, ostendit parochiam. Verum etiam maximo fidelium bono ad hanc usque diem factum declarabit."—Cat. Conc. Trid., pars iii., c. ii., qu. 24.

¶ "Adorari vero imagines, omnibus modis vetat."—S. Greg. Ep. lib. i., ep. xlii., vol. ii., col. 1101. Paris, 1706.

** "Quod Solus Romanus Pontifex iure dicitur universalis."—Greg. vii., Ep. lib. ii., ep. 65. Harduin. Concil., tom. vi., pars i., p. 1304.

†† "Subsecro Romano Pontifici omni humane creaturæ decessum, decessum, definitum, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."—Corp. Jur. Canon. Extrav., lib. i., tit. viii., cap. 1. Tom. ii., p. 394. Paris, 1687.

‡‡ Decret. Conc. Trid., p. 221. Lipsie, 1852.

* "Eundem verò fratrem meum et cœpiscopum meum studiosè admonere curavi, ut si habere pacem omnium concordiamque desiderat, ab ulla vocabuli se appellatione compescat. Ego autem sicut dico, quia quævis de universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sui antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit."—S. Greg. Op., vol. ii., col. 881. Paris, 1706.

† "Cum potestas conferendi indulgentias a Christo ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hejmodi potestate divinitus sibi tradita antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit."—Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. xxv., cont.

‡ "De ortu indulgentiarum, si certitudo haberi possit, veritati indagande opem ferret; verum quia nulla sacre scripture, nulla prisecorum doctorum Græcorum aut Latinorum auctoritas scripta hanc ad nostram detulit notitiam."—Card. Caj. Opusc., tom. ii., fol 46 verso. Venetis, 1680.

§ "Præterea est purgatorius ignis, quo plerum animas ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur."—Catch. Conc. Trid., pars i., qu. iii.

¶ "Quia cum humani casus tempore, sive sanctus, sive malignus spiritus egredientem animam claustra carnis acceperit, in æternum secum etne ulu permutacione retinebit."—S. Greg. Mag., Op., vol. i., col. 253. Paris, 1705.

¶ Polyd. Verg., de inventor rerum, lib. viii., c. i., p. 476. Amstel, 1671.